

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, favorable reconsideration in this application is respectfully requested.

Double Patenting

The Examiner rejects claims 1-22 based on double patenting over claims 1-45 of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,353 ("the '353 patent") since claims 1-22, if allowed, would improperly extend patent rights already granted. The Examiner contends that the subject matter in the present application is fully disclosed in the '353 patent. In particular, the Examiner asserts that claims of both the '353 patent and the present application are directed towards the automated annotation of the displayed object.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the '353 patent and the present application do not cover the same subject matter. Every independent claim of the '353 patent, claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 36, and 41, includes "extracting at least one cartographic feature." In contrast, the present application describes annotating "an element of the view," and independent claims 1, 21, and 22 recite "annotating an element of the view." Paragraphs [0040] to [0063] describe annotating a view or a scene, and in particular, paragraph [0040] discloses "Automated annotation of a view or scene...other than cartographic features." An "element of the view" cannot always be the same as a "cartographic feature." Thus, the '353 patent and the present application do not necessarily claim common subject matter. Since the claims of the '353 patent are directed

towards a “cartographic feature” but the claims of the present application are directed towards an “element of the view,” the Applicants respectfully request that the double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Pritt (U.S. Patent No. 5,689,717). The Examiner contends that Pritt discloses identifying an element, relating the identified element to annotating data, and displaying the annotating data.

The Applicants respectfully submit amended claims 1, 21, and 22 are not anticipated by Pritt. Pritt works with an image that has already been annotated. Pritt is directed towards positioning additional annotation so that they do not overlap on screen. Pritt discloses, in independent claims 1 and 12, a method with the step of “selecting a...position for the additional annotation” and a system with a means for “generating a...position for the additional annotation,” respectively. In contrast, the present application is directed towards “annotating an element” as recited by the amended claims and not towards placing additional annotation.

Also, Pritt does not describe or claim how the image to be annotated is obtained. Claims 1, 21, 22, 36, 38 and 43 of the present invention are directed towards annotating an element identified by a pointing device, the element itself, or a base station, or a generator, none of which are taught by Pritt. Further, the identification means is not the input device as in Pritt because Pritt does not teach that the input device is used to obtain identification of an element (FIG. 1;

Serial No.: 09/817,314
Atty. Docket No.: 123593-00106
Reply to Office Action of July 16, 2002

column 4, lines 65-66). Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention represents a patentable distinction over the art of record.

In the event there are any questions relating to this Amendment or to the application in general, it would be appreciated if the Examiner would telephone the undersigned attorney concerning such questions so that the prosecution of this application may be expedited.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to BLANK ROME LLP, Deposit Account No. 23-2185 (123593.00106). In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith and in the event that a separate petition does not accompany this response, Applicants hereby petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized above.

Respectfully submitted,

BLANK ROME LLP

By: 

Peter S. Weissman
Reg. No. 40,220

600 New Hampshire Ave., N. W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
Telephone: (202) 944-3000
Atty. Docket No.: 123593-00106
Date: June 13, 2007
PSW:HJJ:rc